

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Public Workshop on the Development of a Basin Plan Amendment for the Control of Pesticide Discharges



Introduction

- Joe Karkoski, Chief, Pesticide TMDL Unit
- Jamie Lu, Ph.D., Water Resources Control Engineer
- Paul Hann, Environmental Scientist
- Petra Lee, Environmental Scientist
- Daniel McClure, Water Resources Control Engineer

Meeting Agenda

- Introduction/Agenda Review
- CEQA Scoping Report
- Current Status
- Water Quality Objectives
- Next Steps
- Adjourn

3

CEQA Scoping Report

- CEQA Comment Period Closed on March 17, 2006
- 10 Comment Letters Received
- Respondents included
 - Partner Agencies
 - Coalitions Groups
 - Environmental Advocacy Groups
 - Consultants
 - Private Citizens
 - Chemical Manufacturers

4

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** Verifying the existence of aquatic life is a waste of resources and should be removed from the project scope.
- **Proposed Response:** Beneficial uses must be considered in adopting objectives. However, the proposed project scope will be limited to a review of available information.

5

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** The proposed project should include a general assessment of stream health instead of a simple verification of the presence of aquatic life.
- **Proposed Response:** Resources are not available to perform a general assessment of stream health. No scope change is proposed.

6

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** Aquatic Life Beneficial Uses should be applied appropriately.
- **Proposed Response:** The proposed project already includes a review of aquatic life beneficial uses. No scope change is proposed.

7

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** The proposed project should be changed in recognition that pesticides aren't the only stressor.
- **Proposed Response:** Staff recognize that pesticides are not the only stressor, but resources are not available to concurrently review all potential stressors. No change in scope is proposed.

8

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** Criteria should be based on biocriteria or toxicity.
- **Proposed Response:** The proposed project scope will be changed to evaluate the potential use of biocriteria as water quality criteria. The scope will not be changed to review toxicity as this is already incorporated into the current narrative water quality objective.

9

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** Criteria should be based on a weight of evidence approach.
- **Proposed Response:** The scope of the project will be changed to include consideration of a weight of evidence approach in setting water quality objectives.

10

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** The criteria should be evaluated in accordance with Porter Cologne section 13241, which requires an economic analysis.
- **Proposed Response:** Economic considerations are already proposed as part of the project. No scope change is required.

11

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** Technical comments were made about the relative risk evaluation.
- **Proposed Response:** All technical comments have been deferred to the responses to comments on the Relative Risk Evaluation. No change in scope is proposed.

12

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** The scope of the proposed project should be widened to include additional environmental issues.
- **Proposed Response:** The scope of work has been defined to efficiently utilize available resources. Significant scope expansion is not feasible at this time. No change is proposed.

13

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** The program should be coordinated internally to remove duplication of efforts and minimize the number of new projects put before stakeholders and the public.
- **Proposed Response:** The proposed project scope will be changed to include a description of internal and external roles and responsibilities and how they should be coordinated. Staff will also establish regular communications with stakeholders.

14

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** The program should be coordinated with DPR to establish criteria during the registration process.
- **Proposed Response:** The Regional Board has no direct authority over the DPR's process. However, the scope of work will be changed to include consideration of policies to address coordination and Regional Board involvement in the registration process.

15

Scoping Comments

- **Comment:** Establishment of sediment quality objectives should be deferred until the State Board has completed its process.
- **Proposed Response:** In the Central Valley, the State Board process is focused on the Delta and will not be complete for several years. No scope change is proposed, but staff will track the State's process and consider new information as it becomes available.

16

Next Steps

- Consult with Regional Board Management on Recommended responses
- Complete Scoping Report and Release to Public
- Continue work on technical reports

17

Current Status

- Relative Risk Evaluation
 - Relative risk of pesticides to surface water
 - Working on evaluations for the Sacramento Valley, San Joaquin Valley, and Delta
 - Focused on 1998-2004 pesticide use
 - Non-ag uses will be evaluated separately

18

Current Status

- Sediment Quality Objectives
 - Gathering background information
 - Attending Bay Protection Toxic Hot Spots meetings

19

Current Status

- Beneficial Use Assessment
 - Data compilation is complete
 - Report being written
 - No field work anticipated

20

Current Status

■ Monitoring

- Dormant season samples collected / results under review
- Two months of irrigation season monitoring conducted
- Propanil monitoring starting

21

Where are we in the process?

CEQA Scoping Meeting	February 2006
Draft BPA Staff Report to Peer Review	March 2007
Regional Board Hearing	December 2007
State Board Approval	Mid 2008
Office of Administrative Law Approval	Late 2008
USEPA Approval	Early 2009

22